

BRADLAUGH FOR NORTHAMPTON.

PART I.

OATHS AND ATHEISTS,

ALLEGIANCE AND REPUBLICAN ADVOCACY.

THE oath question, was lately introduced into Parliament, by one who promised to go in, not as an Atheist but as a Politician, and who began as Atheist to claim immunity in that character. This subject promises to be a new form of "obstruction;" and there is danger lest, in order to get rid of a present difficulty and "block" of business, Parliament should be betrayed into measures, whose consequences may be more serious than the occasion; if, indeed the occasion can be regarded as serious by any person acquainted, as the present writer is, with the creed and career of the Claimant to solemnly Affirm his Allegiance.

If he had claimed NOT to Affirm it; if instead of objecting to the *form* of an oath, he had objected to the *subject matter* of the declaration, and instead of being anxious to profess Allegiance, had declined to do so, he would have "voted straight" along the line of his life's advocacy; though he would have thereby infringed on his private view of "utility."

The Claimant confesses that he stands alone among "heretics," in his newly invented delicacy, saying:—"none of the very many actual heretics who have had seats in the House of Commons have ever openly avowed any objection to the oath" (May 9, 1880, p. 290). He who is *the first*, should, from his past oath takings and advice have been the last "heretic" to make the pretence. The far graver question to persons informed on the matter 'is, how the claimant to affirm, can, in any tolerable sense adopt the declaration of "ALLEGIANCE," and, how any one acquainted with the claimant's antecedents, his whole life-course, can accept such "solemn" declaration as other than either a mockery and paltering in a double sense, or, a complete repudiation of his entire career and advocacy, down to the latest period, as when, since his election he, as reported, renewed his old advice to Agricultural Labourers, that they should thrust their spades through the parchment which ties land to its present owners.

He is as "pronounced" an opponent of the English Monarchy as of the Divine Government of the Universe. If he makes the "Affirmation," he might as well take the oath; as he once intended and undertook to do, and proclaimed the fact in his organ.

The occasion and purpose of the Evidence Amendment Acts, which are pleaded as an escape from taking the Parliamentary Oath of Allegiance, were altogether foreign to that case.

The purpose was to remove an alleged grievance in loss of property on the part of infidels, in cases where their oath or evidence was *rejected* by the Judge or Magistrate; or, where it was *objected to* by the opposing party. It was not because they scruple at an oath, at which, according to their best writers, as Birch and Diegesis Taylor, they would laugh as a mere "form," but mainly because others doubted their sworn evidence,

as without moral or "solemn" sanction, and so, on the ground of public utility, not to be accepted.

But the Infidels, as Mr. G. J. Holyoake, alleged loss of property by legal incompetence to claim it on oath when that oath was challenged, and hence the Amendment Act was passed in their favour. But it belonged *only* to that case, it did not apply to jurymen, but to witnesses, it did not apply to nor was it intended for legislators.

A special reason is required for each case. It is one thing for a man to defend his property as a witness, it is another thing to aid in administering as a jurymen; and still another thing to aid in making the law, in which the interests of the whole Empire are involved.

The claimant assumes to be "such person" as the Evidence Amendment Act relieves, though he does not appear as a witness, and does not claim under a Judge in Court.

He cannot pretend that the oath presents to him any "conscientious" difficulty, his own recorded acts and words would render such pretence an insult.

His rule, for himself and his followers is, to take an oath whenever anything of consequence would be lost by *not* taking one. This he deliberately taught and consistently practised.

It must, however, in fairness be acknowledged that the same *rule of convenience*, will permit or require him to refuse an oath, where more advantage, political or pecuniary, in sympathy or in his propagandist trade, would be obtained by refusal, as in what,—a people's man, whom he "comminated" for the supposed sin of attending the "Thanksgiving Service" on the Prince's Recovery—told him he specially loved and fished for, namely, a "mock martyrdom."

This kind of martyrdom, with its attendant gains from sales, and from the "defence fund," the claimant sought for, very ostentatiously, in advertising fashion, over the FRUIT business, in which a good "honest penny" was turned.

The same motive may exist for now turning round and declining to do what he formerly promised, namely to go through "the same forms to which John Stuart Mill submitted." But it would scarcely exalt the dignity of Parliament to strain any Acts, or to alter any rules merely to prevent the claimant's advantage of such martyrdom, as a victim to what, on his own principles, he could easily avoid, by doing again, what he has often done, and advised his flock to do, namely—to swear and bear it—wherever anything can be got out of it.

This he in effect promised and undertook to do in the matter of the Allegiance Oath.

To release him from this promise, and from following up his former acts and advice, would make him a boastful victor over Parliament, instead of being a victim—not even to a crotchet, but to a baffled political manœuvre, which, when seen through would be laughed at rather than cried over, by admiring spectators of the play.

No alteration of law or custom is needed for the one who claims to Affirm, since he *can* take an oath, and always *did*, when required and convenient; especially when, as the most noted prosecutor of free speech as well as the loudest claimant of it, he brought actions against Free-thinkers who dared to doubt his Messiahship.

He not only took oaths himself, when advantageous, but advised "Anxious Enquirers," for whom he "does the thinking," to do the same. Therefore to allow him, *as legislator to Affirm an Allegiance, which as Agitator, he contradicts*, would be no relief to his conscience but would only subserve his convenience, needlessly aggravate his vanity, give a new theme for boasting to "the party," and confer on Parliament a lasting humiliation.

Already he is discounting his position as "elected," and the mere discussion of his claim to Affirm that Allegiance which his life denies, is a source of political capital, and is utilised for trading purposes as a more effective form of advertisement for that partnership Freethought business which was entered into professedly to sell "Fruits of Philosophy," when it was acknowledged that the sale of these "Fruits" was not so much because they were useful to the public, as *because* they were "forbidden" "Fruits" which, from a trading point of view, was expected to give the "Fruits" their choicest flavour, and excite the purchasing appetite of the prurient.

"Utility," in the pretended sense of the public good, is the professed principle of the claimant's Advocacy, but personal advantage, convenience or my "own comfort" and "happiness" in a "secular" sense, is not only the real but the confessed motive of action even so far as "my wife" is concerned; and it is said, not without reason, that this measure of duty was not exceeded.

But these private aims, however noble and self-sacrificing, are not great recommendations to honour and privilege at the hands of Parliament, and at the expense of its dignity prostituted to the whims, caprice and policy of an Atheistic propagandist and "Republican Agitator," who has often played the farce of taking an oath, and defends the same by its utility to himself, and never refused till he thought it safe. But though he could and did swear readily enough; there is no trace yet in his history of his ever Affirming "Allegiance." This new and astounding feat he now waits for permission to perform.

BRADLAUGH ON HIS OATH.

Some cases of Bradlaugh and Truelove being sworn without any objection on their part, and Bradlaugh's readiness to be sworn again, we have not time at present to look up; but the following at hand may suffice to show from Bradlaugh's own account what his habits and principle as to oath taking always were whenever an oath was required.

In his account of an action brought by him to get damages from Brooks, the proprietor of *the Razor* for shaving him too closely, he says: "Mr. Charles Bradlaugh—who, most of the journals observe, *'was sworn on the New Testament, in the usual manner, and with the same form of words.'* Although [says he] they omit to add that it was *the only way* in which Mr. Bradlaugh *could give evidence*; there being no provision for affirmation by a Secularist." [*i.e.* Atheist.] (p. 390, Dec., 1868.)

Here he voluntarily put himself into a position for taking an oath, knowing that he would have to do so, and intending to do it.

He had no other motive for bringing the action, which he has so often brought and more often threatened, but either a desire to get money, or to get revenge, or to prevent, by intimidation of law, persons from criticising his Highness.

If as an Atheist he had had a conscience against swearing by a God whose *impossibility* he demonstrates, he need not have gone into the action. He was voluntary prosecutor, as he often threatens to be, and as he is at this present time, how many "deep," the writer does not know.

Bradlaugh's excuse for taking the oath against Brooks of *the Razor* was that it was the only way to get his damages. He got "a farthing," at least the jury awarded him that amount. So the account ends—"Damages one farthing," and he was "worthy of it."

BRADLAUGH'S ADVICE TO AN "ANXIOUS ENQUIRER,"

"A Scotch Correspondent, who is an *Atheist*, asks us, *what course do you recommend* for an Atheist to follow when called upon in a public court to be sworn as a witness" "where one is not allowed relief from taking the oath by Act of Parliament?"

Answer.—"If the Atheist witness CAN AFFORD to be rejected, he *may* avow his Atheism, and then, if objected to, he will be excluded according to Scotch law as an absolutely incompetent witness."

"Until the law [for England] was altered, WE, *always avowing* our opinions, YET TOOK THE OATH, and refused to answer any questions at all, until we had been sworn. After we had been sworn as a witness, we refused to answer any questions relating to our belief on the ground that they were too late." (p. 73, Aug. 1, 1875.) Here Mr. Bradlaugh puts it as a rule for conscience that if his anxious enquirer "can afford" to be set aside, he "*may* avow his Atheism," which means that if he *cannot* "afford" it, he may conceal it, and take the oath. For himself, he adopts the rule (1) of "always avowing" his "opinions" (2) yet refusing to state them *before* swearing, and (3) declining to avow them *after* swearing, as "too late." (4) Notwithstanding his Atheism he "*yet took the oath*," as long as it was required by the law and was an advantage to himself.

So the Oath of Allegiance need not be set aside in his case: he will take it if necessary; that is, if he does not see a better move in suffering "a grievance" and gaining notoriety as a Martyr without a scruple: when he says—"we always avowing our opinions," he means when *out of court*, and in no danger: for *in court*, he declines to affirm them, *before* swearing as too soon, and *after* swearing, as "too late."

He illustrates his non-avowal of, while "always avowing our opinions," in the following case: "On Mr. Bradlaugh tendering himself as a witness,"—to "the question 'Do you believe in God?' Mr. Bradlaugh, I object to answer that question." This was his rule of not answering "*before*" being sworn. When on the ground of his not answering, he was objected to as not competent to be sworn, as he wanted to be, he said: "My answer is *double*, first, there is nothing in the mere refusal to answer, which can be recognised as any ground of incompetency;" here he *claimed his right to swear*.

He then proceeds with his "double," to claim the right to *Affirm*, under 32 & 33 Vict., c. 68.

But as that was "not a court," nor the magistrate there "a presiding judge," he failed. "Mr. Bradlaugh.—I still tender my evidence. Mr. Wood.—I still object. Mr. Prentice (magistrate). On what grounds?

Mr. Wood.—Mr. Bradlaugh's Atheism. Mr. Bradlaugh.—At present, Sir, proceeding *technically*, I submit *there is no question of Atheism before you*. All that has happened is, that I have objected to reply to the interrogatory, 'Do you believe in a God.'"

This is how "*always avowing our opinions*," is to be understood, "*technically*."

Afterwards, the magistrate ruled that he was "bound to answer," and then he *did* "answer," "Do you believe in a God? Bradlaugh.—I do not, that is," &c., "*technically*" again.

So for that time he failed to sustain his *right to swear* which he *tried for*. Dec. 19, 1869, p. 385.

This illustrates the fact that he was *always ready to swear*; and just now he has given the advice, as his own view and practice: "in order to obtain justice, to COMPLY WITH THE LEGAL FORM while protesting against its continuance." (May 9, 1880, p. 297.) That is, to swear and grumble.

So now he may swear Allegiance and "protest against" the "continuance" of "the legal form," and thus "obtain justice," that is, his seat in the House. He is confessedly the most delicate of "the very many actual heretics who have had seats in the House," "none" else having "ever openly avowed any objection to the oath." (p. 290.) He might have added, "none" of them having sworn so often as himself.

MR. BRADLAUGH ANTICIPATED THE TAKING OF THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

In the expectation of a general election, when possibly some intending constituent enquired whether the oath would not block the way, and so render it useless either to vote for Bradlaugh or to subscribe to his election fund, the following assurance, which looks like a promise, and implied the intention of taking the oath, appeared in Bradlaugh's Notices to Correspondents: "In the event of being elected, we should be obliged to comply with the forms to which John Stuart Mill conformed." (Feb. 9, 1873, p. 89.)

Here he hides himself behind the name of one of "the very many actual heretics" "none" of whom "ever openly avowed any objection to the oath." He *meant* to take it and will, if holding out does not offer a more tempting prospect than caving in.

Perhaps some consolation to doubting minds is intended in the following Notice to Correspondents:—"J. F. Bramley: There is no reason for uneasiness." (May 9, 1880, p. 297.)

BRADLAUGH'S ALLEGIANCE.

While Parliament is confused by astute "technical" quibbles about the obligation to swear or the right to affirm Allegiance, the public at least will look at the moral and merits of the question, whether Bradlaugh is "such a person" as can honestly do *either*.

In his professed if not proper repetition of an alleged conversation with Castelar, there is some such statement as:—"Serrano is above all things a Serranoist, and his King or country is himself." "Such person" could doubtless "affirm" if he could not "swear" Allegiance. Whether, in any other sense, Mr. Bradlaugh could do the same, nobody doubts that knows him.

In his American dollar stump he put a cowardly insult on the Queen and defended the unmannerly and unmanly act by a falsification of the words of a Prime Minister. In *N.R.*, July 25, 1875, p. 58. we read Mrs. Annie Ajax Daybreak's gushing report of Bradlaugh's Hyde Park Oration, the climax being — "He is no Prince of ours." Bradlaugh's objurgations against some representative working men, for the wickedness of going to the Thanksgiving Service to bless God for disappointing some people in the recovery of the Prince, shows the sort of Allegiance he could "*solemnly Affirm.*" "Applegarth, Howell, Leicester, Lloyd Jones, Mottershead and Potter," — "honoured by their Sovereign [in getting tickets of admission] they *deserve* the REMEMBRANCE of the people." (March 24, 1872, p. 185.) "You *know* what I *mean*" by "remembrance," namely,—execration. Bradlaugh accused these men of being "desirous of showing their loyalty": and *he* is "desirous of" making a *solemn Affirmation* of Allegiance. "We still wish to know who *were* the working men who went to St. Paul's." (April 14, 1872, p. 233.) Of course he would crush them, if discovered; for they were not "loyal to Bradlaugh," which is the only virtue of "the Party," or "Pack."

Mr. Mottershead, who happened *not* to have gone "to St. Paul's" gave still graver offence by telling Bradlaugh that he *did* sometimes hear the Archbishop of Canterbury and preferred that prelate's sermons to the harangues of "the prophet of the Hall of Science": but "the most unkindest cut of all," was, that Mottershead declared—I shall scarcely be found "*seeking* any Home Secretary to *make* a MOCK MARTYR of me." (p. 250, April 21, 1872). Mr. Bradlaugh felt this very much, "he *must mean something.*"

The personal savagery with which Mr. Bradlaugh pursues the members of the Royal Family, can be accounted for only by the fact of their keeping him out of his proper position. He resigned his Freemasonry membership (if he ever properly was a member) because the Prince was chosen President.

He says somewhere:—"I *have* a big ambition, bigger than the world dreams of," and the expected membership for Northampton was to be "but the *first* round of the ladder, to the top of which" he meant to climb. Again he says:—"Two ambitions he had had for long, and still had: one, *in life* to climb upwards," "to win the FOREMOST PLACE in his country; and the other *after life* that when he was dead" he might be praised. (Oct. 11, 1874, p. 234.) Self, self, self, is his Master Passion.

The "foremost place," his "top," far above membership for Northampton, was made clear to the Americans by his Republican orations there, which caused him to be proclaimed as the coming "President of the British Republic."

His female partner in business and advocacy writes the "English Marseillaise:"—

We are *sworn* to put tyranny down,
We *strike* at the Throne and the Crown,
To arms! Republicans!
Strike now for Liberty.

Yet Bradlaugh—who promised the Spanish an English Republic—desires to solemnly declare his Allegiance. A former male partner wrote

"We find no God to fear, and we want no King to honour above ourselves." (April 11, 1875, p. 227.)

Bradlaugh as President, at "the top," can take the place both of Monarchy and Divinity, so "a poet of their own" sings:—

Of *him* we are the Volunteers
With all our Freethought bands,
And, Theists, if you'll have a God,
Hail ONE where BRADLAUGH stands.

(Nov. 11, 1875, p. 273.)

Bradlaugh's modesty is equal to his Allegiance, hence "to correspondents" he says:—"F. E. C. France.—The *too-flattering* words you use as *to ourselves* prevent us from printing your letter to Dr. Parker." March 8, 1874, p. 153. What those words were, which were "too-flattering" "to ourselves" to be inserted, may be imagined from what he *does* insert. He *selected* and sent home for insertion as American testimonials what will also serve as specimens both of his modesty and Allegiance. This is a portrait which he sent home:—"He has" "a massive head, in whose brain are evolved *those thoughts* the utterance of which causes THE BRITISH MONARCH TO QUAKE with fear of the popular tempest, which will come sooner or later, overturning the throne, and destroying the last vestige of hereditary monarchy in England." "It is no wonder that the down trodden and oppressed people of England look up to HIM as the MOSES to lead them out of bondage." (Jan. 18, 1874, p. 35.) This no doubt is a fair summary of the impression made by his Allegiance Republican lectures in America. Perhaps Cousin Jonathan will stare when he reads the penitent attitude, in which Bradlaugh now offers his solemn affirmation of Allegiance, and unless our Cousin sees some deep plot of policy in seeking the coign of advantage for some new move of which "the world little dreams," Jonathan might recant his Thanksgiving on Bradlaugh's merciful escape from his sad fall on the ice in Kansas City.

This devout jubilation, which is as follows, was transferred by Bradlaugh from *The Kansas City Times* to his own self-adulatory organ:—

"It is a merciful PROVIDENCE that this great and good man was saved: otherwise "thousands of the poor and oppressed in Great Britain would to day be in mourning, and the ROYAL HOUSE" and "Aristocracy would be REJOICING over" "the removal of the Republican Agitator." (Ibid, p. 2.) But he is TAME now; and wants to solemnly affirm his Allegiance, though in one account in his paper, we read somewhere respecting his impeachment of the Royal House, to the effect that if guilty of one-twentieth of the crimes Bradlaugh laid to its charge in his lecture, it should not be permitted to live any longer in England.

What "a merciful providence" that "this great and good man," "Charles Bradlaugh, future President of England," once lodging "at the Fifth Avenue Hotel," and "interviewed" by *The New York Herald*, should now proffer a solemn declaration of Allegiance. "This is the man [so the Herald says and the organ of 'the Pack' reproduces it] who can and has led for twenty-five years the masses of the people in England who PRAY for a Republic of law and order, and whose prayers, if successful, must entail the downfall of the English landed Aristocracy." "His NAME has often palsied the arm of the English Government," (Oct. 12, 1873, p. 226.) "*The New York Daily Tribune*," we are told in Brad-

laugh's organ, "had an ably written memoir of [by?] Mr. Bradlaugh." "The Tribune notice concludes thus: 'In a crisis the world would probably hear a great deal more of Charles Bradlaugh. As MIRABEAU observed of ROBESPIERRE, *this man will do something; he believes [?] every word he says.*'" (Oct. 12, 1873, p. 228.)

The last sentence should describe every honest man, for none *such* would ever say what he does not himself believe; though no man is obliged to believe a solemn Affirmation that contradicts the whole life and aim of the Affirmer, unless it be as a solemn RECANTATION, given as such, and with some reasonable ground for believing that the change is real and lasting: and not merely one of words adopted as a "form" for ulterior purposes and selfish ends.

MR. BRADLAUGH'S ALLEGIANCE AFFIRMATION.

A PETITION TO PARLIAMENT.

To the Honourable, the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled,
The Petition of the undersigned,

Humbly sheweth—

That the attention of your Honourable House having been called by the Hon: Member elected for Northampton to his special position, touching the Oath of Allegiance:

And a Select Committee being appointed by your Honourable House to enquire into and report upon the said Hon: Member's claim to Affirm instead of to Swear Allegiance:

It is humbly prayed by your Petitioner that means be adopted by your Honourable House to ascertain whether the Claimant to Affirm Allegiance be competent for such Affirmation; and that for the purpose of ascertaining this, the declarations and proceedings of the said Hon: Member, as published by himself and as affecting his Allegiance, be enquired into and examined, and compared with that solemn Affirmation of Allegiance which the said Hon: Member offers to make as a qualification for full admission into your Honourable House, and, that not only the Forms, whether of Oath or Affirmation be considered, but also the subject matter and substance of that Allegiance required to be declared, so that where the right to Affirm may be conceded, it shall not be extended to any who by overt acts or publications, are proved not to be able rightly and truly to make such Affirmation of Allegiance.

And your Petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) BREWIN GRANT, B.A.,

Vicar,

May 20, 1880.

St. Paul's, Bethnal Green.

THE ATHEIST BRADLAUGH DEMANDING THE OATH AS BINDING ON AN ATHEIST'S CONSCIENCE.

Before Mr. Justice Lush, Mr. Bradlaugh, who was the first person in the Atheistic "Trinity," put forward Mr. Austin Holyoake, the second person, as his Witness, and demanded the Oath for him, after objecting

to his being questioned about his Atheism as affecting "his competency. [to swear], *before being sworn.*" "Mr. Bradlaugh, who conducted his [own] case in person," suggested a point of conscience to his brother Atheist, thus :—

"Mr. Bradlaugh (to Mr. A. Holyoake)—Do you OBJECT to be sworn? No.—*Is the OATH, in its present form, BINDING on your conscience? It is.*"—Oct. 25th, 1868. P. 265.

But now, as "such person" conscientiously objecting to an Oath, as not binding on his conscience, or otherwise not politically convenient, he demands to *solemnly* affirm his Allegiance,—such as it is. See his American Stump, and his Embassy to Madrid from the Casuals at Birmingham in Republican Conference assembled.

Will *he* eat the leek and swear; or will the House eat the leek for him, and relieve his conscience, at its own expense?

BRADLAUGH'S ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, WILL HE EAT THE LEEK AND SWEAR?

It was suggested in the former part, that he *would* take the oath, if convenient, after seeing "which way the cat jumps:" and now he is on his knees at the door of "the House" begging to be allowed to swear! "I *said* he would." Annie, who is cleverer than himself, has indicated the equivocation, that the Oath of Allegiance "*ONLY* promises Allegiance to the Queen and her successors, according to law." (p. 354 *Special* for May 30, 1880.)

This "saving clause" for Jesuitism, she puts in *italic*, and it is to prove that Allegiance and AL-LIE-GEANCE, are all the same.

So he can swear Allegiance with a view to altering the law; and keep his "word of honour," which is proverbial; and to which, now, is added his "conscience," and what more can be required, by the "truly rural."

When we saw him on his knees praying to be sworn after failing to Affirm, as we expected to see him—there being "no reason for uneasiness,"—the following questions were proposed, as suited to that stage of the farce.

There was to be an enquiry for "precedents,"—whether Sir Henry Drummond Wolff's objection to accept the oath of a Member who had prayed to affirm, and who had publicly recanted his doctrine of the binding character of the oath, was supported by "precedents;" and to aid the House, the ensuing questions were propounded.—

QUESTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

1.—Can there be any "precedent" for a *new case*, in which a Member elect refuses the oath, and then offers to take it, having meanwhile declared it an unmeaning form?

2.—Is it not a case for principles rather than precedents?

3.—*Is it just to Northampton* to permit the qualification by oath of one, who, *since* his election, appears in a character which he repudiated in his canvas, and who, after his election, refused to take the oath, which, during his candidature, he had, in effect, and in published words, promised to take?

4.—Does not the said Member elect, appear now in a different character to that in which he was elected, and is not this a greater reason for his seeking re-endorsement from the constituents than if he had been appointed to a Government office, and, if he now sought re-election, would he get it?

5.—Is he not repudiated by the best man, who, “in the hurry of the moment” recommended him, and thus secured his election by “misdirection?”

6.—Does he not betray his “more pious friends” the Dissenters, by beginning in a character which he gained their votes by repudiating, and saying, he should serve them *not* as an Athiest, but as a politician?

7.—Is the House bound in honour to aid this betrayal by relaxing its rules for one who uses it for his convenience and whose principles are in harmony with his immediate prospects?

8.—Would either his Affirmation or his Oath of Allegiance be relied upon by any who know his writings and efforts?

9.—Was not the Right Hon. John Bright right in saying that the Affirmation of the said elect Member is as good as his Oath, and was this sarcastic?

10.—Would either Affirmation or Oath of Allegiance be a mockery of the House and of the subject, or else be a recantation of the whole life-effort of the claimant?

11.—Do the claimant’s chameleonic exhibitions on the oath question and on the being of a God make him “such a person” that the fundamental principles of the Empire should be moulded to his caprice and his proclaimed “big ambition”?

12.—What is “the top” of that “ladder” to which he is pledged “to climb,” and of which Membership of the House is only “the *first* round.”

13.—Is it any reason for favouring this “big ambition,” because, *first*, he equivocates respecting God, as lately, swearing in Court that an Atheist never denies a God, when he had defined an Atheist as one who does deny a God; when he pretends to demonstrate the *impossibility* of a God, which is more than denying one; or, because, *secondly*, he equivocates about an Oath, saying, that it may be taken when advantageous; denying its binding character when inconvenient, affirming its binding character on the conscience of an Atheist, when profitable; and putting forward an Atheistic co-propagandist, as his witness, to make such Affirmation; declaring the hypocrisy of the Oath as an unmeaning form, when carrying “the flag of Free-thought into St. Stephen’s,” refusing to swear on this ground, then grovellingly praying for permission to swear, after telling the House, through the country, that it would be a farce to do so?

14.—If “such a person” is now prepared to eat the leek and swear, is the House bound to share in eating the leek, and was the meaning of the late general election simply to show that in England as in America, the word “Liberal” is prostituted to mean “Infidel” or “Atheist”?

15.—Is the present scheme, an effort to make the English Parliament, especially the Liberal majority, the cats-paw of the Atheistic Republican crew, which Bradlaugh calls “the Party,” and which is properly called “the Pack”?

16.—Does not Bradlaugh's Organ, from which all the quotations with date and page in the preceding Pamphlet are taken, claim that its pretendedly secular but merely Atheistic Clubs and propagandists, secured the Liberal majority; that these Atheists are the only logical Dissenters, or true Nonconformists and are the backbone, liver and lungs if not "lights" of the great united Liberal Party?

17.—Will the House endorse these claims, will the majority *accept the identity*, and wear "the stigma" which Bradlaugh said belonged to his "opinions," and which he carried to Castelar as an Embassy from his conference of casuals at Birmingham, and, under which, Castelar sunk?

18.—Will English Liberalism accept an alliance which is professedly intended for its extinction, after utilising it as the opportunity of "the Party of the Future?"

BREWIN GRANT, *Vicar*,

St. Paul's, Bethnal Green, E.

PROPOSAL TO WRITE "THE LIFE OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH
DONE FROM HIS OWN WORKS AND MAINLY IN HIS OWN
WORDS."

Whether the Claimant to Affirm and to Swear, succeed or fail to put "the stigma" of his opinions on the Liberal Party, whether "the House" pass by his Northampton Appeal against its second Special Committee of Enquiry, and, by some Act in his favour, admit him because he does "not menace the House," nor threaten to reward its Members who have dared to give an opinion on his proceedings, is no special concern of the writer. But the prominence into which the Claimant has struggled, is a fitting occasion for turning John Bull's eye on the figure.

"*Is there anybody here that knows him?*" was the anxious enquiry of a character in Martin Chuzzlewit; and as the writer is an old acquaintance of the Claimant and is not dependent on present professions made for the occasion; he proposes to carry out Bradlaugh's own direction:—

"Why do you not ANSWER Mr. ——— OUT OF HIS OWN MOUTH? *His three-half-penny journal would afford PLENTY OF MATERIAL.*" Bradlaugh to correspondent, Oct. 11th 1868, p. 233.

These and other sources of information afforded by the Claimant will be utilized in the said "LIFE," by *Bradlaugh's OWN, ONLY AND TWICE CERTIFICATED MASTER*, BREWIN GRANT.

Those who would know Bradlaugh's teachings and aims, and see them refuted and exposed should read the following:—

PUBLICATIONS BY
THE REV. BREWIN GRANT, B.A.

Published by GRANT & CO., 6, Harcombe Road, Stoke Newington, N.,
and 11, Gossett Street, Bethnal Green, E.

THE GREAT SOUTH PLACE DEBATE, between the REV. BREWIN GRANT, B.A., and Mr. CHARLES BRADLAUGH, M.P., with Notes. People's Edition 2s. 2d., post free.

THE INFIDEL CARD TRICK EXPOSED, or "*Mr. Bradlaugh's Line of Retreat*" since the South Place Debate, and the "*Misfortunes of his Life.*" Post free 6½d.

THE INFIDEL GOLIATH—Mr. BRADLAUGH and his Vaunts over the *Christian Evidence Society*. 52nd Thousand, Post free 1½d.

SIX LESSONS FROM THE WAINWRIGHT WHITECHAPEL TRAGEDY. 1½d.

"THE DISSENTING WORLD," an *Autobiography*. By the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A. Third Edition, with portrait, post free 5s. 5d.

THE GREAT MYSTERY SOLVED.—A sermon, 1d., post free.

PRIZE ESSAY ON THE ROMISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE for which the Trinitarian Bible Society awarded to the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A., their first prize of £200, October, 1876. Post free 1s. 1d.

REPORT OF A DISCUSSION between the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A., and Mr. JOSEPH SYMES (Infidel) four nights in the Hartlepoons, Feb., 1880. Post free, 1s. 2d.

PRIZE ESSAY ON THE SABBATH, by the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A., being a defence of Sunday as a Memorial of the Six days' work, defended by reason and scripture, against Infidel perversions of science and against Atheistic Materialism. Post free, 1s. 8d.

BRADLAUGH FOR NORTHAMPTON. OATHS AND ATHEISTS. Allegiance and Republican Advocacy; an introduction to HIS LIFE. Second Edition, Post Free, 1½d.

IN THE PRESS.

"THE LIFE OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH, done from his own works, and mainly in his own words." This work will be published in a series of penny numbers to bring it within the reach of the working classes.

Any who are interested in this question of the ATHEISTIC and REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT, and are willing to aid in enlightening the public respecting the most dangerous, insidious and corrupting propagandism of Blasphemy, Petroleum, and Licentiousness, are requested to communicate with the Publishers, Messrs. GRANT & Co., 6, Harcombe Road, Stoke Newington, N., and 11, Gossett Street, Bethnal Green, E., who will be glad to supply bills for distribution.